



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/813,901	03/30/2004	Berna Erol	015358-010000US	5028
20350 7590 05/15/2008 TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER EIGHTH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834				
EXAMINER				
TRAN, QUOC A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2176				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/15/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/813,901

Applicant(s)

EROL ET AL.

Examiner

Quoc A. Tran

Art Unit

2176

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 11 April 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☒ The Notice of Appeal was filed on 04/11/2008. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-11 and 13-69.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Quoc A. Tran/
Examiner, Art Unit 2176

/Rachna S Desai/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2176

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's Request for reconsideration Remarks filed 04/11/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The reason is set forth in the Final Office Action mailed 12/11/2007 and further view of the following:

Applicant argued that Chui would not achieved or rendered obviousness to combine with Coar, because Chiu and/or Coar do not disclose "user-selectable object being inserted into an electronic representation of a document, wherein selection of that user-selectable object allows a user to access a related portion of recorded information,"- See the Remarks Pages 18-20.

The examiner disagrees.

For purposes of responding to Applicant's argument, the examiner will assume that Applicant is arguing for the patentability of Claim 1.

As discusses in the previous Office Action dated 11/12/2007, Chui at Fig.1 and 5 discloses browser interface (item 300) for accessing a segment of video file (item 200) which references scanned document (item 101a), wherein browser interface 300 includes window (item 302) for viewing scanned documents (item 301 and 101a). This allows a user may double-click on the scanned document (item 301 or 101a) and browser interface (item 100a) will play in window (item 203) the corresponding recorded segment of event (item 50) referencing the scanned documents. Also the scanned documents (item 301 and 101a) may be represented by hyperlinked universal resource location ("URL") addresses, where the video may be resided- See Chiu at Fig. 1-5 and at Column 3, Line 45 through Column 4, Line 15.

Chiu does not expressly teach, "Generating a user selectable object...corresponding to the visual feature" However Coar discloses this limitation in that generating a machine readable symbol at the time which the paper document printed, wherein those machine readable symbol are programmatic interface to permit interaction with all portions of the package (i.e. the resulting electronic package file would then contain an image of the paper document and the index data in a form that permits easy extraction and transfer to another system- See Coar at Para 31), permit security access, edit, view, extraction, processing, and delivery of contents- See Coar at Para 23, 31, and 41-42.)

Accordingly it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chiu's browser interface for accessing a segment of video file which references scanned document, to include a means of said generating a machine readable symbol at the time which the paper document printed, wherein those machine readable symbol are programmatic interface to permit interaction with all portions of the package (i.e. the resulting electronic package file would then contain an image of the paper document and the index data in a form that permits easy extraction and transfer to another system), permit security access, edit, view, extraction, in order to provide a user selectable objects referencing the scanned document and segments of selectable portion of the embedded video or URL directed to selectable portion of the embedded video See Chui at Colum 1 Line 65 through Column 2, Line 10 and at Fig. 1-5 and at Column 3, Line 45 through Column 4, Line 15.

Thus, Chiu and Coar disclose every limitation of Claim 1 and provide proper reasons to combine, as indicated herein and Office Action dated 12/11/2007.

Accordingly, the Examiner respectfully maintains the Final Rejection mailed 12/11/2007 at this time.

/Quoc A. Tran/
Examiner, Art Unit 2176